

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 20-29 are pending in this application. Claims 9-12 and 15-19 are canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. By this Amendment, claims 1-8, 13 and 14 are amended and claims 21-29 are added. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiners Lui and Awad in the August 3, 2006 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Formal Matters**

Claims 3-5 satisfy all formal requirements. The Office Action objects to claims 3, 4 and 5 because each claim recites a third, fourth and fifth transistor, respectively, when no intermediate transistors are claimed after a first transistor. By this Amendment, claim 2 is amended to recite a second transistor and claim 5 is amended to depend from claim 1. However, first, second, third, etc., identify and differentiate each transistor. First, second, third, etc. are not used to list the transistors in sequence. Thus, claims 3, 4 and 5 satisfy all formal requirements. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

**A. Claims 1, 3-8, 13, 14 and 20**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-8, 13, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,229,506 to Dawson et al. (Dawson) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196215 to Tsuchida et al. (Tsuchida). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As asserted during the personal interview, claims 1, 3-8, 13, 14 and 20 would not have been rendered obvious by Dawson in view of Tsuchida. Neither of the applied references teaches or suggests an electronic circuit that includes "a capacitor that is capable of

accumulating a current signal and a voltage signal in a form of an amount of charge ... the first transistor supplying a current whose amount is determined in accordance with the conduction state to an electronic element," as recited in independent claim 1. Similarly, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests an electro-optical device that includes "a first circuit that outputs a current signal that is accumulated in a capacitor including each of the plurality of unit circuits; and a second circuit that outputs a voltage signal that is accumulated in a capacitor included in each of the plurality of unit circuits," as recited in independent claim 6.

The Office Action acknowledges that Dawson does not disclose a capacitor that is capable of accumulating high voltage. The Office Action asserts that Tsuchida remedies the deficiencies of Dawson. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

As asserted during the personal interview, Tsuchida does not disclose a capacitor as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Tsuchida only discloses that the constant voltage sources and the constant current sources determine a pixel electrode of an EL element. (See, e.g., Tsuchida, paragraphs [0029] and [0044].). Because neither of the constant voltage sources nor the constant current sources determine the conduction state of the transistor, Tsuchida does not remedy Dawson's deficiencies. Thus, the alleged combination would not have achieved the capacitor recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and asserted during the personal interview, independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Dawson and Tsuchida. Further, claims 3-5, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 20, which variously depend from independent claims 1 and 6, are also patentable over Dawson and Tsuchida, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 6, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**B. Claim 2**

The Office Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dawson and Tsuchida and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058195A1 to Adachi et al. (Adachi) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0154104 to Inoue et al. (Inoue). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claim 2 would not have been rendered obvious by Dawson and Tsuchida and further in view of Adachi and Inoue. Adachi and Inoue do not remedy the deficiencies of Dawson and Tsuchida discussed above with respect to claim 1. Adachi and Inoue are cited by the Office Action only for their teaching of a data current and data voltage, respectively. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 2 is patentable over Dawson, Tsuchida, Adachi and Inoue for at least the reasons discussed above and asserted during the personal interview with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 20-29 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: August 15, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461